

REMARKS

In the present amendment claim 1 is amended and new dependent claims 2-6 are added.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by US 5,559,695 to Daily.


The material recited in amended claim 1 and new added claims 2 and 3 regarding use of a scaling factor is supported by the discussion on pages 7 and 8 and the second paragraph of page 11. The option of the images comprising more than two images, recited in added claim 4, is supported throughout the text, e.g. page 3, first paragraph, page 12 lines 23-24, and Figs. 2A and 2B. The material recited in added claims 5 and 6 regarding a likelihood of collision is supported by the discussion of Figs. 2A and 2B on pages 11 and 12.

Applicant notes that US 5,559,695 cited by the Examiner against the unamended claim 1 determines a time to collision using optical flow. It does not teach or intimate in any manner using a scaling factor as claimed in amended claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 1 and claims dependent thereon are therefore patentable over the cited patent.

In accordance with the Examiner's request in the Office Action, applicants attach a replacement sheet of drawing figure 2A, illustrating the center of curvature 0.

An action on the merits is respectfully awaited.

Respectfully submitted,
Gideon P. STEIN, et al.


Michael J. GERVER,
Reg. No. 52,940

April 26, 2005

William H. Dippert, Esq.
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue, 29th Floor
New York, NY 10022-7650

Tel: (212) 521-5400